

## REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were pending in the application at the time the present Office Action was mailed. Claims 1, 11, 32, 36, and 51 have been amended to clarify certain features of these claims. Claim 10 has been amended solely to correct the antecedent basis of certain features of the claim. Accordingly, claims 1-54 remain pending in the application.

The status of the application in light of the Office Action dated January 11, 2005, is as follows:

(A) Claims 1-3, 5, 6-14, 16-18, 36-38, 40, 41, 44, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,713,162 to Munson et al. ("Munson");

(B) Claims 32, 35, 51, 52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,653,980 to Ceccom et al. ("Ceccom");

(C) Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceccom in view of Munson;

(D) Claims 4, 6, 15, 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 53 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims; and

(E) Claims 19-31 and 48-50 were indicated to be allowable.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone interview on April 5, 2005. During the telephone interview, the Examiner and the undersigned attorney discussed the present Office Action, the applied references (Munson and Ceccom), the pending claims, and proposed amendments to claims 1, 32, and 36. The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the interview, and they also reflect the agreements reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the interview. For example, the following remarks

reflect the Examiner's acknowledgment that claims 1, 32, and 36, as amended, are allowable over the applied references.

A. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5, 6-14, 16-18, 36-38, 40, 41, 44, and 46

Claims 1-3, 5, 6-14, 16-18, 36-38, 40, 41, 44, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Munson. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the April 5 interview that Munson cannot support a Section 102 rejection of independent claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6-10 depend from base claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, and 6-10 are allowable as depending from claim 1, and also because of the additional features of these dependent claims. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 2, 3, 5, and 6-10 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 11 and 36 include several features generally similar to claim 1 (e.g., an antenna configured to be installed within a portion of an aircraft). Accordingly, these claims are allowable over Munson for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and for the additional features of these claims. Furthermore, during the April 5 interview the Examiner agreed that Munson cannot support a rejection of these independent claims. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of claims 11 and 36 should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-14 and 16-18 depend from base claim 11, and claims 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, and 46 depend from base claim 36. Accordingly, Munson cannot support a Section 102 rejection of these dependent claims for at least the reason that this reference cannot support a Section 102 rejection of corresponding base claims 11 and 36, and for the additional features of these dependent claims. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of claims 12-14, 16-18, 37, 38, 40, 41, 44, and 46 should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 102 Rejection of Claims 32, 35, 51, 52, and 54

Claims 32, 35, 51, 52, and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ceccom. During the April 5 interview, the Examiner acknowledged that Ceccom cannot support a Section 102 rejection of claim 32. Therefore, the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

Claim 35 depends from base claim 32. As discussed above, claim 32 is allowable. Therefore, claim 35 is allowable as depending from claim 32, and also because of the additional features of this dependent claim. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claim 35 should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 51 includes several features generally similar to claim 32 (e.g., a generally cylindrical antenna). Accordingly, claim 51 is allowable over Ceccom for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 32, and for the additional features of this claim. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection of claim 51 should be withdrawn.

Claims 52 and 54 depend from base claim 51. As discussed above, claim 51 is allowable. Therefore, claims 52 and 54 are allowable as depending from claim 51, and also because of the additional features of these dependent claims. Accordingly, the Section 102 rejection of claims 52 and 54 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claim 34

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ceccom in view of Munson. Claim 34 depends from base claim 32 and accordingly includes the features of claim 32. As noted above, the Examiner has acknowledged that Ceccom fails to disclose the features of claim 32. Munson fails to fill the voids of Ceccom as a reference that anticipates claim 32. Accordingly, dependent claim 34 is allowable over Ceccom and Munson for at least the reason that Ceccom and Munson together fail to disclose the features of claim 32 and the additional features of claim 34. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Objection to Claims 4, 6, 15, 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 53

Claims 4, 6, 15, 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 53 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4, 6, 15, 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 53 have not been rewritten in independent form because their respective base claims should now be in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, the objection to claims 4, 6, 15, 33, 39, 42, 43, 45, 47, and 53 should be withdrawn.

E. Allowable Claims

The applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claims 19-31 and 48-50. Although the undersigned attorney agrees with the Examiner's conclusion that these claims are allowable, the undersigned attorney notes that the claims may be allowable for reasons other than those identified by the Examiner and does not concede that the Examiner's characterization of the terms of the claims and the prior art are correct.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-3982.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

Date: 4/6/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aaron J. Poledna  
Registration No. 54,675

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000